arXiv:1701.02786v1 [stat.ME] 10 Jan 2017

The Design of Order-of-Addition Experiments

Joseph G. Voelkel
School of Mathematical Sciences
College of Science
Rochester Institute of Technology
Rochester, NY 14623
(*joseph.voelkel@rit.edu*)

January 12, 2017

Abstract

We introduce designs for order-of-addition (OofA) experiments, those that study the order in which m components are applied. Full designs require $m!$ runs, so we investigate design fractions. Balance criteria for creating such designs employ an extension of orthogonal arrays (OA's) to OofA-OA's. A connection is made between D-efficient and OofA-OA designs. Necessary conditions are found for the number of runs needed to create OofA-OA's of strengths 2 and 3. Our designs include 24-run OofA-OA's in 5 and 6 components, and near OofA-OA's in 7 components. We extend these designs to include both process factors and the common case in which component orderings are restricted.

Keywords: D-efficiency; Experimental design; Minimum chi-square; Minimum moment aberration; Orthogonal array.

1 INTRODUCTION

An early reference to an order-of-addition (OofA) experiment (Fisher(1971)) is that of a lady tasting tea, who claimed she could distinguish whether the tea or the milk was first added to her cup. Fisher's experiment consisted of four replications of each of tea→milk and milk→tea.

More complex OofA applications appear in a number of areas, including chemical, food, and film, although in the author's experience such applications tend to be proprietary. An application in the public arena includes, Preuss, et al. (2009, p. 24), who note that"The next step [in an investigation] is usually to determine the order of action of the protein with respect to known treatments required at the same general transport step. This approach is sometime referred to an order of addition experiment..." A PerkinElmer (2016) reference states "Order of addition can influence the signal generated to a large extent. *The optimal order in which assay components interact should always be determined empirically...* some binding partners may interfere with the association of other binding partners if allowed to interact in the wrong order."(italics ours.) Other references to OofA experiments include Black, et al. (2001) and Kim, et al. (2001). None of these references mention a strategy of experimenter design—rather, a small subset of select orders was investigated.

In this paper, we will denote each material whose order of addition is being considered as a *component*. If there are m components, say $c_0, \ldots, c_{m-1}$, then there are $m!$ possible combinations of orders. An experiment with 5 components or more would normally be considered excessively large, so our interest is to find good fractions of such designs. Our objectives in this paper are to:

1. Review past work in the field;
2. Consider goodness criteria for fractionating an OofA design;
3. Investigate the goodness of the designs created by these criteria, including a comparison of these designs to those from past work;
4. Extend these designs to include process factors as well—for example, varying the temperature or the amount of c_1;
5. Consider designs in which restrictions are placed on component ordering.

2 PAST WORK

Given the importance of order of addition in certain experimental areas, it is surprising that little research has been done to create good OofA designs. The only direct statistical

reference for creating such designs appears to be Van Nostrand (1995), whose primary approach was to select a fraction of such combinations with good properties, as follows:

1. Create "pseudo factors" (which in this paper we will call *pair-wise ordering* (PWO) factors). There are $\binom{m}{2}$ PWO factors, corresponding to all pairs of component orders $\{Fc_k{<}c_l, 0 \le k < l \le m-1\}$, where F is included in these names to emphasize these are factors, and each $Fc_k{<}c_l$ is at two levels, 1 and 0, to indicate whether or not component k is added before component l, respectively. So, if $m = 4$, the six PWO factors are $Fc_0{<}c_1,\ Fc_0{<}c_2,\ Fc_0{<}c_3\ Fc_1{<}c_2,\ Fc_1{<}c_3,\ Fc_2{<}c_3$.

2. Create a tentative two-level design in these $\binom{m}{2}$ PWO factors, fractionated to a suggested number of starting runs. For $m = 5$, for example, with 10 PWO factors, this might correspond to a 2^{10-3} design, the hope being that, because the full 2^{10} would include all valid $5! = 120$ combinations, then a particular 2^{10-3} design might include about $N = 120(2^{-3}) = 15$ valid combinations.

3. Reduce the number of runs in the fraction to include only valid combinations. For example, if the fraction includes a suggested run such as $c_0 < c_1,\ c_0 > c_2,\ c_1 < c_2$, such a run would be excluded.

For five factors, Van Nostrand examined the eight fractions from a particular 2^{10-3} family—that is, all eight combinations of $\pm G_1,\ \pm G_2,\ \pm G_3$, where the G_i's are the words in the generator. For each combination, he considered the main-effects model, and then used the mean VIF's (variance-inflation factors) from each model to measure the goodness of each design. In his example, the number of valid runs from his 128-run fractions ranged from 13 to 17; the 13-run designs were singular, and the other designs had mean VIF's in the range from 3.3 to 3.6. (The mean VIF in the full, 120-run, design is 2.) He noted that different sets of words in the generator lead to different designs, and that "[p]rinciples for assigning letters to generators to produce designs with low variance inflation factors are not yet apparent."

An author whose designs appear to be more widely used for OofA experiments is Williams (1949, 1950). However, Williams' intent was to create designs not for OofA experiments, but for crossover experiments—experiments in which each subject receives m treatments in succession. His designs address the possibility that one or more preceding treatments as well as the current one may affect the response—his designs are balanced for these so-called residual effects. Williams showed that designs that are balanced for the effect of only one preceding treatment exist for m treatments in one $m \times m$ Latin Square (m runs) if m is even—this is known as a cyclic row-complete Latin Square—and two such

Latin Squares ($2m$ runs) if m is odd. In these Latin Squares, rows indicate the run (or subject) number, columns the treatment order, and Latin letters the treatment.

In addition, if m is a prime or a power of a prime, then Williams showed that a design in $m-1$ Latin Squares ($m(m-1)$ runs) may be created that is balanced for any number of preceding treatments, where their interactions are not taken into account. Williams also created designs for m treatments, again in $m-1$ Latin Squares, that are balanced for each pair of preceding treatments in both of their orders, so that residual-effect interactions may be taken into account.

3 APPROACH AND CRITERIA

Williams' designs lead to certain balance properties. However, these properties are not directly connected to OofA considerations. For example, the natural factors in Williams' designs, as shown in his 1949 example, are replications, order, treatments (direct), and treatments (residual), each with $m-1$ d.f. But none of these are natural factors of interest in an OofA experiment.

Our approach for creating OofA designs will employ Van Nostrand's use of PWO factors, which emphasize the order of addition, and so are *a priori* a natural set of factors to use. However, we will not restrict ourselves to certain classes of designs as Van Nostrand and Williams did.

Define the design matrix $\mathbf{D}$ to be an $N \times m$ matrix, each of whose rows contain a permutation of $c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{m-1}$, where the k^{th} column of $\mathbf{D}$ shows which component is entered at stage k. (This definition will be extended when process variables are also considered.) The full design matrix $\mathbf{D}_F$ is the $m! \times m$ matrix of all such permutations. For any $\mathbf{D}$, an $N \times m'$ *PWO design matrix* $\mathbf{P}$ can be generated, where $m' = m(m-1)/2$. In particular, $\mathbf{D}_F$ generates the full PWO design matrix $\mathbf{P}_F$. Now, it is clear that, given m components, any $m-1$ columns of $\mathbf{D}_F$ (the remaining column being so defined) are necessary to generate $\mathbf{P}_F$. The converse is also true, as we now show.

Proposition 1. *For m components, all m' columns from the $\mathbf{P}_F$ matrix are necessary to generate the $\mathbf{D}_F$ matrix.*

Proof. The results are obvious for $m = 2$. For $m > 2$, suppose that at least one of the PWO-factor columns is not needed. Consider the specific case where $Fc_0{<}c_1$ is not needed. (By the symmetry of the problem, we need to show a result only for a specific case.) But then, for example, the remaining PWO-factor columns could not distinguish between the two permutations $c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \ldots < c_{m-1}$ and $c_1 < c_0 < c_2 < \ldots < c_{m-1}$. ■

To create and judge these designs, it will be useful to consider the following, which we do in the next three subsecions:

1. model-based and balanced-based criteria;

2. measures of goodness;

3. algorithms to create designs.

3.1 General Criteria and Goodness Measures

A recent review of several criteria for constructing designs may be found in Lekivetz, et al. (2015), some of which we will consider. A common method of constructing designs using model-based criteria employs one or more of the "alphabetic-optimality" criteria, for example D-optimality, which tries to find a candidate design $\mathbf{X}$ that maximizes $|\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}|$, where $\mathbf{X}$ is the model matrix. The main-effects model matrix $\mathbf{X}$ corresponding to an OofA design with PWO matrix $\mathbf{P}$ is $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{1}|\mathbf{P}]$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is a conformable vector of 1's.

Alternatives to model-based criteria are balanced-based criteria, and for those it is natural to consider orthogonal arrays (OA's). Here, using notation based on Hedayat, et al. (1999), an $N \times k$ array (matrix) $\mathbf{A}$ each of whose columns contain s levels is said to be an OA with strength t if every $N \times t$ sub-array of $\mathbf{A}$ contains all possible t-tuples the same number of times—this array may be denoted as $OA(N, s^k, t)$. For mixed-level designs, where k_i factors are at s_i levels, the notation $OA(N, s_1^{k_1} s_2^{k_2} \ldots, t)$ may be used, and the definition can be extended in a natural way. In the usual case where each column corresponds to a factor, an array of strength t corresponds to a design of at least Resolution $t + 1$.

There are several ways to measure balance relative to an OA for $t = 2$. One, used by Yamada and Lin (1999), is a χ^2 measure. Let $n_{kl}(a, b)$ be the number of rows of $\mathbf{A}$ in which level a appears in column k and level b appears in column l. Then the χ^2 measure for the $\{k, l\}$ column pair is

$$\chi^2_{kl}(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{a=1}^{s_k} \sum_{b=1}^{s_l} \frac{[n_{kl}(a, b) - N/(s_k s_l)]^2}{N/(s_k s_l)}, \tag{1}$$

where s_k and s_l are the number of levels in their respective columns and $N/(s_k s_l) = N(s_k/N)(s_l/N)$ is the frequency that would occur under an orthogonal array. An overall measure of non-orthogonality is then

$$\chi^2(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{1 \le k < l \le p} \chi^2_{kl}(\mathbf{A})/[p(p-1)/2], \tag{2}$$

the average of all such measures, where $\chi^2(\mathbf{A}) = 0$ for an orthogonal array and $\chi^2(\mathbf{A}) > 0$ otherwise. The maximum of all such $\chi^2_{kl}(\mathbf{A})$ measures may also be considered.

3.2 Criteria and Goodness Measures for OofA Experiments

We will examine the model-based approach using the D-criterion, but we first note that it can be limiting for very-small-N designs. For example, Williams' 10-run balanced design in 5 components corresponds to a model matrix $\mathbf{X}$ that is 10×11, so $|\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}| = 0$. One way to handle this problem would be use the approach suggested by Wu (1993) for supersaturated designs; however, we will not examine very-small-N designs in this paper using the D-criterion.

Next, consider a χ^2, balanced-based, measure of non-orthogonality. It turns out that the χ^2 of Yamada and Lin cannot be used directly for OofA experiments. To see this, consider the $m = 4$ case. There are $4! = 24$ permutations in the full design, with $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ PWO factors—see Table 1—so there are $\binom{6}{2} = 15$ tables of pairs of PWO factors. Three distinct tables exist and are shown in Figure 1, along with examples of PWO factors that generated them. In the first table (8 such tables exist), "$c_0 <$" appears in both PWO factors—this is a *synergistic pair* of PWO factors and is denoted in the table as P_{syn}. In the second table (4 such exist), "$c_1 <$" appears in one factor and "$< c_1$" in the other factor—this creates an *antagonistic pair* of PWO factors, denoted as P_{ant}. (Although we distinguish between these two tables here, they are in fact isomorphic, where two tables are isomorphic if one can be obtained from the other by possibly switching one or more labels and/or the directions of inequalities.) In the third table (3 such exist), one pair of components appears in one factor and the other pair in the other factor—this creates an *independent pair* of PWO factors, denoted as P_{ind}. Because there is a natural lack of balance among a subset of these pairs of PWO factors even when *all* combinations are run, the criterion of Yamada and Lin cannot be used directly as a measure of goodness.

For a more complex example, consider $m = 6$, with 720 permutations and 15 PWO factors, and strength $t = 3$. (The $m = 6$ case corresponds to the smallest m that illustrates all the features we show below for $t = 3$.) To do this, we need consider the 455 sets of 3 of these 15 factors; these sets of 3 may be represented as $2 \times 2 \times 2$ tables. There are 5 non-isomorphic tables in this case. See Figure 2, where the tables are arranged from least to most balanced, the PWO-factor labels have been removed, the frequencies in each table have been divided by 30 for ease of understanding, and the frequencies of such tables (out of 455) are shown. Type 1 tables correspond to 3 components, such as $Fc_0{<}c_1, Fc_0{<}c_2, Fc_1{<}c_2$; Type 2 tables to four components, with two components in two PWO's, such as $Fc_0{<}c_1, Fc_0{<}c_2, Fc_1{<}c_3$; Type 3 tables to four components, with one in all three PWO's, such as $Fc_0{<}c_1, Fc_0{<}c_2, Fc_0{<}c_3$; Type 4 tables to five components, with

Table 1: Four-Factor OofA Design $\mathbf{D}_F$, with PWO Design Matrix $\mathbf{P}_F$.

	Design $\mathbf{D}_F$				PWO Design Matrix $\mathbf{P}_F$					
					$Fc_0{<}c_1$	$Fc_0{<}c_2$	$Fc_0{<}c_3$	$Fc_1{<}c_2$	$Fc_1{<}c_3$	$Fc_2{<}c_3$
1	0	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	0	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	0
3	0	2	1	3	1	1	1	0	1	1
4	0	2	3	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
5	0	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0
6	0	3	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
7	1	0	2	3	0	1	1	1	1	1
8	1	0	3	2	0	1	1	1	1	0
9	1	2	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	1
10	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
11	1	3	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
12	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
13	2	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	1	1
14	2	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
15	2	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	1
16	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
17	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
18	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
19	3	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	0
20	3	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
21	3	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
22	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
23	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
24	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Figure 1: The three table types of pairs of PWO factors for the $m = 4, t = 2$ case, with factor examples and frequency counts.



Figure 2: Five non-isomorphic table types for the $m = 6, t = 3$ case, with relative (of N=24) frequencies for each type. Tables are arranged from least to most balanced.

one in two PWO's, such as $Fc_0{<}c_1, Fc_0{<}c_2, Fc_3{<}c_4$; and Type 5 tables to six components, such as $Fc_0{<}c_1, Fc_2{<}c_3, Fc_4{<}c_5$. As m increases, the relative frequencies of table Types differ—for example, the fraction of tables of Type 5 increases to a limit of 1.

The natural lack of balance seen in Figure 1 and Figure 2 leads to the following definition, which includes the PWO-factor case as well as the possibility of additional, process, factors:

Definition 1. *An $N \times m'$ array whose columns consist of all of the PWO factor levels for m components is said to be an Order-of-Addition Orthogonal Array (OofA-OA) of strength t for m components if every $N \times t$ sub-array of the array contains all possible t-tuples in the relative fractions corresponding to those found when all $m!$ runs are considered. Such an array will be denoted as OofA-OA(N, m, t). If the array is augmented with p additional columns associated with factors whose levels in each column may be varied independently of the first m' columns and each other, and if N_p^* is the number of combinations of these p*

additional columns, then the resulting $m!N_p^* \times (m' + p)$ *array replaces the original* $m! \times m$ *array.*

In particular, the rules for standard OA designs of strength t apply to any t-tuple sub-arrays that are created from the process variables alone.

Using this definition and examining Figure 1 and Figure 2, we can state the following.

Proposition 2. *An OofA-OA of strength* 2 *exists for* $m > 3$ *only for* $N = 0 \bmod 12$. *An OofA-OA of strength* 3 *exists for* $m > 3$ *only for* $N = 0 \bmod 24$.

In particular, for $m = 4$ only the full design with $N = 24$ is strength 3.

We will use these restrictions on N in our search for OA's. These restrictions seem to us to be stronger than for the OA case, and also show that most of Williams designs cannot be OofA-OA's. (For $m = 4$, Williams(1949) did provide one design with $N = m(m-1) = 12$ runs, but it was not an OofA-OA, and Williams(1950) noted that no solutions exist for those designs for the $m = 4$ case, for which N would also have been 12. The next larger m for which $N = 0 \bmod 12$ is $m = 9$.)

With this definition, we can now generalize the Yamada and Lin measure. For simplicity, we show the result only for the pure OofA case. For $t = 2$, the χ^2 measure for the $\{k, l\}$ column pair for an array $\mathbf{A}$ becomes

$$\chi^2_{kl}(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{a=1}^{s_k} \sum_{b=1}^{s_l} \frac{[n_{kl}(a,b) - NE_{kl}(a,b)/m!)]^2}{NE_{kl}(a,b)/m!}, \tag{3}$$

where $E_{kl}(a, b)$ is the frequency of the occurrence of levels a and b in columns k and l respectively in the full design $\mathbf{P}_F$—see Figure 1 and, after multiplying by 30, Figure 2 for examples of $E_{kl}(a, b)$ values. When $E_{kl}(a, b) = 0$, we define that contribution to the sum to be 0. When p, say single-d.f., terms for process variables with a possible N_p^* treatment combinations are included, we simply modify $E_{kl}(a, b)$ to be based on the full $m!N_p^* \times (m+p)$ design.

The overall measure of non-orthogonality is again the average of all such measures, which we denote by $\chi^2_{ave,2}(\mathbf{A})$, where the subscript indicates strength 2; we denote the maximum of all such measures as $\chi^2_{max,2}(\mathbf{A})$. A third measure we consider is the fraction of all $\chi^2_{kl}(\mathbf{A})$ that are 0, which we denote by $FO_2(\mathbf{A})$.

We will find that in many cases we obtain more than one OofA-OA array for $t = 2$, in which case it is natural to consider secondary measures of goodness, in particular the $t = 3$ properties of these designs. To this end, we consider all 3-tuples of columns, and so modify $\chi^2_{kl}(\mathbf{A})$ to, say, $\chi^2_{klu}(\mathbf{A})$ and call the resulting overall average measure as $\chi^2_{ave,3}(\mathbf{A})$. Similarly, we modify FO_2 to FO_3. We also consider $t = 2$ or $t = 3$ properties when we leave

out one component at a time, a projective property of the design. For designs that are not OofA-OA's, we examine m leave-one-out designs and consider the average-over-m measures $\chi^2_{ave,2}$ and FO_2, which we denote by $\chi^2_{ave,2,-1}$ and $FO_{2,-1}$, respectively. For OofA-OA's, we instead consider $\chi^2_{ave,3,-1}$ and $FO_{3,-1}$.

The above measures all have clear statistical bases. Another measure we consider is the minimum-moment-aberration criterion of Xu (2003). Let $\delta_{ij}(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \delta(P_{ik}, P_{jk})$ be the number of coincidences in the ith and jth rows of $\mathbf{P}$, where δ is the Kronecker delta function. (The Hamming distance between the rows, $m - \delta_{ij}(\mathbf{P})$, was used by Clark and Dean (2001) to show the equivalence (isomorphism) of fractional factorial designs.) Xu defines the sth power moment of $\mathbf{P}$ to be $K_s(\mathbf{P}) = [N(N-1)]^{-1} \sum_{1 \le j < k \le N} [\delta_{ij}(\mathbf{P})]^s$. We standardize this measure of similarity among rows as $Sim_s(\mathbf{P}) = (K_s(\mathbf{P}))^{1/s}$, where $Sim_1 \le Sim_2 \le Sim_3 \ldots$ by Jensen's inequality. Designs with the lowest Sim_1 values are best—ties are broken by successively considering $Sim_2, Sim_3, \ldots$.

Our emphasis will be in constructing orthogonal OofA designs of strength 2. Efficient algorithms exist for finding OA designs in the case where all columns of the design matrix may be considered independently, e.g. Xu (2002) and Lekivetz, et al. (2015), but this is not the case for OofA designs. Efficient algorithms do exist, however, for finding D-optimal designs for the OofA case, in which we have a set of candidate points from $\mathbf{X}_F$, from which a subset is selected for the design $\mathbf{X}$. For this reason we consider only the D-criterion for most of the design construction below. Our use of this criteria is also partly justified by the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Assume that the matrix* $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{1}|\mathbf{P}]$ *is of full column rank. Then* $\chi^2_2 = 0$ *for* $\mathbf{P}$ *only if* $\mathbf{X}$ *has a D-efficiency of 1 relative to* $\mathbf{X}_F$.

Proof. If $\chi^2_2(\mathbf{P}) = 0$, then $\mathbf{P}$ corresponds to an OofA-OA. In particular, the relative (i.e., N-adjusted) frequency of each of the 2×2 tables that are formed from all pairs of columns of $\mathbf{P}$ correspond to those of $\mathbf{P}_F$. This also applies to the corresponding matrices $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}_F$ because the constant column is orthogonal to all other columns. But these relative frequencies also determine the relative values of the $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}$ matrix, which, by the same reasoning, are equal to those of the $\mathbf{X}'_F\mathbf{X}_F$ matrix. Because of this, the D-efficiency of $\mathbf{X}$ with respect to $\mathbf{X}_F$ is equal to 1. ■

We have not been able to prove the converse. However, in all of our work, we have found that whenever $\mathbf{X}$ has this D-efficiency of 1 then the corresponding $\chi^2_2 = 0$. We have also not been able to prove that whenever $\mathbf{X}$ has this D-efficiency of 1, then $\mathbf{X}$ is D-optimal. However, all of our work suggests this, as does the fact that $\mathbf{X}_F$, the OofA analog of a full factorial, intuitively appears to be the best arrangement in $m!$ runs.

We use *PROC OPTEX* from SAS/QC software with various numbers of iterations and the Federov option to obtain efficient designs. It is possible to use this procedure to extract all of the designs found or only all of the most efficient designs. We also use the function *optFederov* from the *R* package *AlgDesign* (Wheeler, 2014), but we are only able to extract one design from each function call regardless of the number of iterations. For this reason, our results are often based on a number of designs from SAS software and one from *R* software.

In the next three sections, we present our results. First, we briefly compare our designs to some of the designs created by Van Nostrand and Williams. We then consider designs where OofA-OA's may (and if fact, often do) exist. Our approach usually generates a number of OofA-OA's, and this leads us to consider ways to distinguish among them. Finally, we consider several examples of OofA-OA's in which process-variable factors are also included. Our objective is not to create a catalog of such designs, but rather to illustrate several of them and their properties.

4 RESULTS: COMPARISONS TO PAST WORK

So that designs in this section may be shown concisely, we will define them through the row-index values of $\mathbf{D}_F$, where the rows of this design are arranged in lexicographic order. (The function *permutations* from the *R* package *gtools* (Warnes, et al., 2015) provides designs in this order.)

Van Nostrand considered a 5-component problem, and using his methods found a 15-run design that corresponds to rows (2, 18, 27, 35, 42, 44, 52, 53, 55, 72, 81, 89, 101, 103, 110) of $\mathbf{D}_F$. The mean *VIF*, used by Van Nostrand, was 3.28. Using our measures for this design, $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 1.41$ and $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 0.79$, where D_{eff} is the D-efficiency with respect to $\mathbf{D}_F$.

Our OofA-OA search using the D-criterion yielded 13 designs that had $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.29$ and D-efficiency=0.96, with a mean *VIF* of 2.17, which compares well to the corresponding value of 2 for the full, 120-run, design. One such design had row indices (1, 6, 15, 19, 22, 46, 55, 68, 70, 76, 81, 83, 94, 95, 104). Somewhat surprisingly, none of our 13 designs were isomorphic—this is a consideration we will examine in more detail when we compare OofA-OA's below.

We next consider two 5-component Williams' designs. The first, in 10 runs, is balanced for the effects of the preceding treatment, with row indices (1, 6, 15, 19, 22, 46, 55, 68, 70, 76, 81, 83, 94, 95, 104). Because an $\mathbf{X}$ associated with $m = 5, N = 10$ cannot be of full-column rank, the D-efficiency measure is useless. So we wrote a simple search algorithm using the $\chi^2_{ave,2}$ criterion and found a good design with row indices (3, 10, 32, 38, 46, 64, 86, 94, 99, 101). Williams' design yields $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.80$ and $\chi^2_{max,2} = 3.2$, while ours yields

$\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.50$ and $\chi^2_{max,2} = 1.7$. We also decided to compare the projective properties of the designs when each component in turn is left out of the design. First consider the average D efficiency of the 5 leave-one-out designs. For the Williams design, $\mathbf{X}$ has column rank of only 6, so no leave-one-out designs have full column rank—the average D efficiency is 0. For our design, $\mathbf{X}$ has column rank of 10, and all leave-one-out designs have full column rank, with an average D efficiency of 0.84. For Williams design, $\chi^2_{ave,2,-1} = 0.88$; for ours, $\chi^2_{ave,2,-1} = 0.51$.

The second 5-component William's design we consider, in 20 runs, is balanced for any number of preceding treatments, with row indices (4, 7, 18, 21, 27, 35, 40, 44, 50, 60, 61, 71, 77, 81, 86, 94, 100, 103, 114, 117). We searched for designs using both $\chi^2_{ave,2}$ and D-efficiency criteria, and obtained the following results. Williams' design yields $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.71$, $\chi^2_{max,2} = 1.6$, and $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 0.78$, while ours, using the minimum $\chi^2_{ave,2}$ criterion, yields $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.15$, $\chi^2_{max,2} = 0.8$, and $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 0.90$, with row indices (2, 9, 20, 28, 36, 37, 42, 51, 52, 56, 72, 78, 81, 83, 89, 101, 103, 109, 112, 116); using the maximum D_{eff} criterion yields $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.27$, $\chi^2_{max,2} = 1.2$, and $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 0.97$, with row indices (4, 12, 14, 16, 29, 34, 37, 47, 50, 59, 62, 63, 82, 92, 96, 99, 105, 108, 115, 119). So, based on these criteria, designs that are specifically created for OofA considerations lead to better designs than those designed for balance with respect to certain residual-treatment effects.

From this example,we can also see that a correspondence between OofA-OA's ($\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0$) and $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 1$ does not imply that, in comparing two designs, a design with a lower $\chi^2_{ave,2}$ must have a higher D-efficiency.

5 RESULTS: SOME OofA OA OR NEAR-OA DESIGNS

In this section, we consider five OofA designs. Because it turns out that OofA OA's may be constructed for all but the last of them, the notation *OofA*-OA(N, m, t) will be used to describe the first four.

5.1 *OofA*-OA$(12, 4, 2)$ Designs

For *OofA*-OA$(12, 4, 2)$, 100 starting points from PROC OPTEX produced 88 *OA* designs, and *AlgDesign* another 1. However, these yielded only two non-isomorphic designs, shown in Table 2. Both both designs had $Sim_1 = 3$ and $Sim_2 = 3.34$, the values for the full 24-run design; however, $Sim_3(\mathbf{P}_1) = 3.55 < Sim_3(\mathbf{P}_2) = 3.57$, so Design 1 is superior based on this measure. Design 1 also had superior secondary measures: $\chi^2_{ave,3} = 0.82$ vs. 1.49 and $FO_3 = 0.40$ vs. 0.30. We were also surprised to see that while the best design

had each component balanced with respect to its order of addition, as one might hope for, the second design was quite imbalanced: for example, component 1(2) appeared second in order 0(6) times, and third in order 6(0) times—we will see imbalance in later designs as well. Based on all of these criteria, Design 1 is superior.

Table 2: The two non-isomorphic *OofA*-OA$(12, 4, 2)$ designs, with reference-design rows.

Design 1		Design 2	
0 1 3 2	2	0 2 1 3	3
0 2 1 3	3	0 2 3 1	4
0 3 1 2	5	0 3 1 2	5
1 0 2 3	7	1 0 3 2	8
1 2 3 0	10	1 2 0 3	9
1 3 2 0	12	1 2 3 0	10
2 0 3 1	14	1 3 0 2	11
2 1 0 3	15	2 0 1 3	13
2 3 0 1	17	2 3 1 0	18
3 0 2 1	20	3 0 1 2	19
3 1 0 2	21	3 2 0 1	23
3 2 1 0	24	3 2 1 0	24

5.2 *OofA*-OA$(12, 5, 2)$ Designs

For *OofA*-OA$(12, 5, 2)$, 100 starting points from PROC OPTEX produced 40 OA designs, and *AlgDesign* another 1. However, all designs were isomorphic. One of these is shown in Table 3, with secondary measures $\chi^2_{ave,3} = 1.24$ and $FO_3 = 0.42$.

5.3 *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ Designs

For *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$, 300 starting points from PROC OPTEX produced 37 OA designs, and *AlgDesign* another 1. An additional 36 OA designs were produced as follows—from the 6 *OofA*-OA$(24, 6, 2)$ designs that will be discussed below, each design was used to create 6 *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ designs by leaving out one component at a time. From the resulting 74 designs, we were surprised to find that 73 were non-isomorphic—we assign these ID numbers (1–36 OPTEX; 37 *AlgDesign*; 38-73 leave-one-out).

Table 3: The *OofA*-OA$(12, 5, 2)$ design, with reference-design rows.

0 4 2 1 3	21
0 4 3 1 2	23
1 0 3 2 4	27
1 2 3 0 4	33
1 4 0 2 3	43
1 4 3 2 0	48
2 0 3 1 4	51
2 4 0 1 3	67
2 4 3 1 0	72
3 0 2 1 4	75
3 4 0 1 2	91
3 4 2 1 0	96

Consider the $\chi^2_{ave,3}$ measures, which are graphed versus the FO_3 and Sim_3 measures in Figure 3. (Here, 65 designs had $Sim_1 = 5$ and $Sim_2 = 5.40$, the values for the full design, while the 8 others had $Sim_1 = 5.01$ and $Sim_2 = 5.41$—these 8 designs stand out in each of the graphs, and are shown with smaller symbols.) Both graphs indicate that five designs, denoted by overlaid $\times$'s, are the best in this group. This is further corroborated by the $\chi^2_{ave,3,-1}$ and the $FO_{3,-1}$ measures—see Table 4. These five criteria were then used to rank the 73 designs (tied ranks were assigned to the lowest rank)—these ranks are shown parenthetically in the Table. From these, average ranks ($\overline{\text{Rank}}$) were obtained, leading to the ranks (Rank) among these five. The Design ID's (ID) are also provided, as well as the worst measured value among all 73 designs for each of the criteria.

Table 4: Rankings for The *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ designs.

ID	Rank	$\overline{\text{Rank}}$	FO_3	$\chi^2_{ave,3}$	$FO_{3,-1}$	$\chi^2_{ave,3,-1}$	Sim_3	RMV_{ord}
33	1	1.0	0.85(1)	0.51(1)	0.88(1)	0.43(1)	5.739(1)	2.52(67)
43	2	1.6	0.83(2)	0.56(2)	0.88(1)	0.43(1)	5.740(2)	2.52(67)
5	3	3.4	0.82(3)	0.63(3)	0.84(4)	0.58(4)	5.742(3)	1.99(41)
73	4	4.2	0.80(5)	0.68(5)	0.86(3)	0.51(3)	5.744(5)	1.25(1)
57	5	4.8	0.82(3)	0.64(4)	0.82(7)	0.65(7)	5.742(3)	2.14(49)
		worst:	0.41	1.76	0.45	1.65	5.781	2.86



Figure 3: FO_3 and Sim_3 vs. $\chi^2_{ave,3}$ for 73 *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ Designs. The eight designs with inferior Sim_1 values are shown with smaller symbols, and the five best design are show with overlaid $\times$'s.

However, as for *OofA*-OA$(14, 4, 2)$, we next consider the balance of each design with respect to its order of addition, which we now summarize as follows. Define f_{kl} as the frequency with which component k appears in the lth order. Then create the unbalance measure $RMV_{ord} = [(1/mN)\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\sum_{l=1}^{N}(f_{kl} - \overline{f_{k.}})^2]^{1/2}$. (Note that full balance ($RMV_{ord} = 0$) is not possible for this design because 24 is not divisible by 5.) The RMV_{ord} values in Table 4 show large differences among the five designs, with the highest-ranked design based on the earlier measures being quite imbalanced in its component-order-of-addition. We believe this large imbalance would be a concern for most experimenters, and the other measures are not too dissimilar, so we would likely recommend design ID 73 in practice. This design as well as design ID's 5 and 33 appear in Table 5, along with their f_{kl} values.

5.4 *OofA*-OA$(24, 6, 2)$ Designs

The *OofA*-OA$(24, 6, 2)$ designs were more difficult to obtain, so the number of starting points was increased in PROC OPTEX to 5000. That produced 5 *OA* designs, and *AlgDesign* was used to obtain one more. All designs were non-isomorphic, and were assigned ID numbers (1–5 OPTEX; 6 *AlgDesign*).

Four designs had $Sim_1 = 7.5$ and $Sim_2 = 7.96$, the values for the full design, while the other two designs had $Sim_1 = 7.51$ and $Sim_2 = 7.97$. More details on the four are

Table 5: Three *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ designs (ID's 5, 33, 73) with reference-design rows, followed by f_{kl} values. (For OA columns, see Section 6.)

	Design 5		Design 33		Design 73		$OA(2^4)$	$OA(2^2 3^1)$	
							1 2 3 4	1 2	3
1	0 1 4 3 2	6	0 1 2 4 3	2	0 1 2 4 3	2	1 1 1 1	1 1	2
2	0 2 1 4 3	8	0 1 3 4 2	4	0 2 4 3 1	12	1 1 1 0	1 1	1
3	0 2 3 4 1	10	0 2 3 1 4	9	0 3 1 4 2	14	1 1 1 1	1 1	1
4	0 3 2 1 4	15	0 3 2 4 1	16	0 4 1 3 2	20	1 1 1 1	1 1	2
5	0 3 4 2 1	18	0 4 2 1 3	21	1 0 3 2 4	27	0 1 1 0	0 1	2
6	1 0 4 2 3	29	0 4 3 1 2	23	1 0 4 2 3	29	0 1 1 0	0 1	2
7	1 2 0 3 4	31	1 0 2 3 4	25	1 2 3 4 0	34	0 0 1 1	0 0	2
8	1 2 4 0 3	35	1 3 2 4 0	40	1 3 0 2 4	37	0 1 0 1	0 1	1
9	1 3 0 2 4	37	1 4 0 3 2	44	1 4 3 2 0	48	0 0 1 0	0 0	1
10	1 3 4 2 0	42	1 4 2 3 0	46	2 0 1 3 4	49	1 0 0 1	1 0	1
11	2 0 4 1 3	53	2 1 0 4 3	56	2 0 3 4 1	52	1 0 0 1	1 0	1
12	2 1 3 4 0	58	2 1 3 0 4	57	2 1 4 0 3	59	0 1 0 0	0 1	0
13	2 3 0 1 4	61	2 3 4 0 1	65	2 3 1 0 4	63	0 0 1 1	0 0	2
14	2 4 3 1 0	72	2 4 0 1 3	67	2 4 3 0 1	71	1 0 0 0	1 0	0
15	3 0 4 1 2	77	2 4 3 1 0	72	3 0 4 2 1	78	1 0 1 1	1 0	2
16	3 1 2 0 4	81	3 0 4 1 2	77	3 1 4 0 2	83	0 1 0 1	0 1	1
17	3 1 4 0 2	83	3 1 2 0 4	81	3 2 0 1 4	85	1 0 0 0	1 0	0
18	3 2 4 0 1	89	3 1 4 0 2	83	3 2 4 1 0	90	0 0 0 0	0 0	0
19	4 0 1 2 3	97	3 2 0 1 4	85	3 4 0 1 2	91	1 0 1 0	1 0	2
20	4 1 0 3 2	104	3 4 2 1 0	96	4 0 2 1 3	99	1 1 0 0	1 1	0
21	4 2 0 3 1	110	4 1 2 0 3	105	4 0 3 2 1	102	1 1 0 0	1 1	0
22	4 2 1 3 0	112	4 1 3 0 2	107	4 1 2 0 3	105	0 1 0 1	0 1	0
23	4 3 0 1 2	115	4 2 0 3 1	110	4 2 1 3 0	112	0 0 0 1	0 0	0
24	4 3 2 1 0	120	4 3 0 2 1	116	4 3 1 2 0	118	0 0 1 0	0 0	1
0	5 4 6 4 5		6 2 6 6 4		4 7 3 5 5				
1	5 5 3 7 4		4 8 0 8 4		5 4 6 4 5				
2	4 7 3 5 5		5 3 9 1 6		5 5 3 7 4				
3	4 7 3 5 5		5 4 6 4 5		5 4 6 4 5				
4	6 1 9 3 5		4 7 3 5 5		5 4 6 4 5				

provided in Table 6. The unbalance measure RMV_{ord} breaks the tie between the top two designs. Although full balance may be possible in this case, none of these designs achieved it. The three highest-ranking designs appear in Table 7, along with their f_{kl} values.

Table 6: Rankings for the top four *OofA*-OA$(24, 6, 2)$ designs.

ID	Rank	$\overline{\text{Rank}}$	FO_3	$\chi^2_{ave,3}$	$FO_{3,-1}$	$\chi^2_{ave,3,-1}$	Sim_3	RMV_{ord}
6	1.5	1.6	0.69(2)	1.10(2)	0.72(1)	1.00(1)	8.406(2)	1.12(1)
3	1.5	1.6	0.70(1)	1.06(1)	0.70(3)	1.10(2)	8.403(1)	1.79(5)
1	3	3.4	0.66(3)	1.25(5)	0.70(2)	1.12(3)	8.415(4)	2.01(6)
2	4	3.6	0.65(4)	1.22(3)	0.67(4)	1.17(4)	8.412(3)	1.74(3)
		worst:	0.52	1.38	0.54	1.36	8.425	2.01

5.5 Seven-Component Designs

No *OofA*-OA$(24, 7, 2)$ designs were found after 5000 starting points in each of PROC OPTEX and *AlgDesign*. The best design had $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 0.990$, with $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.07$, with row indices (823, 839, 909, 1167, 1466, 1525, 1653, 1791, 2226, 2258, 2517, 2721, 2927, 2935, 3071, 3515, 3602, 3642, 4001, 4259, 4332, 4415, 4865, 5009). Using the same process, no *OofA*-OA$(36, 7, 2)$ designs were found, the best having $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 0.970$ and $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.29$, with row indices (454, 486, 551, 629, 637, 881, 1296, 1377, 1470, 1529, 1711, 1947, 2068, 2154, 2353, 2382, 2408, 2726, 2794, 2935, 3039, 3117, 3215, 3263, 3340, 3367, 3505, 3649, 3742, 3874, 4060, 4268, 4330, 4559, 4627, 4896); no *OofA*-OA$(48, 7, 2)$ designs were found, the best having $D_{\mathit{eff}} = 0.985$ and $\chi^2_{ave,2} = 0.22$, with row indices (69, 171, 253, 307, 445, 606, 706, 777, 823, 912, 1009, 1050, 1223, 1547, 1604, 1716, 1756, 1810, 1905, 2021, 2143, 2232, 2284, 2448, 2824, 3030, 3216, 3290, 3357, 3368, 3602, 3806, 3828, 3920, 4013, 4036, 4044, 4182, 4287, 4419, 4463, 4533, 4609, 4754, 4781, 4810, 4842, 4853).

6 RESULTS: COMPONENTS AND PROCESS VARIABLES

We next investigate the addition of process variables to OofA designs. Formally, we want to consider adding p additional factors to our design, and we let N_p^* be the number of possible combinations of their levels. The levels of these factors may be free to vary independently,

Table 7: Three *OofA*-OA$(24, 6, 2)$ designs (ID's 6, 3, 1) with reference-design rows, followed by f_{kl} values.

	Design 6	Design 3	Design 1
1	0 1 5 2 4 3 20	0 1 2 5 4 3 6	0 3 2 1 4 5 55
2	0 2 4 3 5 1 40	0 2 3 4 5 1 34	0 3 4 1 5 2 62
3	0 3 1 5 4 2 54	0 3 1 4 5 2 52	0 4 2 5 3 1 84
4	0 4 5 1 3 2 92	0 3 2 5 1 4 59	0 5 2 1 4 3 104
5	1 0 3 2 5 4 128	0 4 5 1 3 2 92	0 5 4 1 3 2 116
6	1 2 3 4 0 5 153	1 0 5 2 3 4 139	1 2 4 0 5 3 158
7	1 4 3 2 5 0 208	1 3 2 4 5 0 178	1 3 2 0 4 5 175
8	1 5 3 0 2 4 229	1 3 5 0 4 2 188	1 4 2 3 5 0 202
9	2 0 5 1 3 4 259	1 4 2 5 0 3 203	1 5 3 0 4 2 230
10	2 1 4 5 0 3 281	1 4 3 0 5 2 206	1 5 4 0 3 2 236
11	2 3 1 0 4 5 295	2 0 4 1 3 5 253	2 1 0 3 5 4 266
12	2 5 0 3 4 1 340	2 4 3 1 5 0 328	2 3 0 1 5 4 290
13	2 5 4 3 0 1 359	2 5 1 3 0 4 345	2 4 1 5 3 0 324
14	3 0 4 2 1 5 375	3 1 2 0 5 4 392	2 5 0 4 3 1 342
15	3 4 5 0 1 2 451	3 4 0 2 1 5 435	3 2 5 4 0 1 431
16	3 5 2 0 1 4 469	3 5 4 1 2 0 478	3 4 0 2 5 1 436
17	3 5 2 4 1 0 474	4 2 1 0 5 3 536	3 5 1 0 2 4 463
18	4 0 2 1 3 5 487	4 2 3 0 5 1 542	4 1 0 2 3 5 505
19	4 0 5 3 2 1 504	4 5 3 1 0 2 597	4 3 0 1 5 2 554
20	4 1 5 2 0 3 525	5 0 4 3 2 1 624	4 3 5 2 1 0 576
21	4 3 1 2 0 5 561	5 2 1 4 0 3 659	4 5 2 0 1 3 589
22	5 1 0 4 2 3 629	5 2 3 0 1 4 661	5 0 1 2 3 4 601
23	5 3 1 4 0 2 683	5 3 2 4 0 1 689	5 2 3 4 1 0 666
24	5 4 2 1 3 0 712	5 4 0 1 2 3 697	5 3 1 4 2 0 684
0	4 5 2 4 6 3	5 3 2 6 5 3	5 1 6 6 1 5
1	4 4 4 4 4 4	5 2 4 6 3 4	5 2 4 6 3 4
2	5 2 4 6 3 4	3 5 6 2 3 5	4 3 6 4 2 5
3	4 4 4 4 4 4	3 5 6 2 3 5	3 7 2 2 7 3
4	4 4 4 4 4 4	3 6 3 5 2 5	4 4 4 4 4 4
5	3 5 6 2 3 5	5 3 3 3 8 2	3 7 2 2 7 3

as we have suggested to this point for simplicity, but they can, in fact, be constrained—we illustrate both cases below.

Our objective in this section is to illustrate how this may be done, and to this end we consider augmenting a *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ design with each of the following terms:

1. main effects for a 2^2 design
2. main effects for a 2^3 design
3. main effects for a 2^4 design
4. main effects for a 2^{4-1}_{IV} (constrained) design
5. main effects for a $2^2 \times 3$ design

Note that the number of treatment combinations for all but the 2^4 design divides into 24. We could create each design from basic principles—for example, there are $120 \times 16 = 1920$ candidate points for the third design. Our strategy, however, will be to first find an *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ design and use this design instead of the 120-run design. In our example, this reduces the number of candidate points to $24 \times 16 = 384$. In addition, it may also be possible to fractionate the process-variable portion as well—this case leads to the fourth design, with $24 \times 8 = 192$ candidate points.

For our results, we choose to use Design ID 73 as our *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2)$ design, and we show results only for the 2^4 and $2^2 \times 3$ designs. In obvious notation, we call these designs as *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2; 2^4)$ and *OofA*-OA$(24, 5, 2; 2^2 3^1)$. These results appear in Table 5, where for brevity we refer to the two process-variable portions as $OA(2^4)$ and $OA(2^2 3^1)$.

The 2^3 result may be constructed from factors 2–4 from the 2^4, and the 2^2 from two of these factors 2–4. We were not able to find an *OofA*-OA with the 2^{4-1}_{IV} design for Design ID 73, but were able to do so for Design ID 33 (not shown).

7 DESIGNS WITH RESTRICTIONS, AND NOTES ON ANALYSIS

In our work above, we have assumed that all m! permutations are in the set of candidate points. However, this may often not be the case. For example, the experimenter may be convinced that constraints are necessary, such as $c_0 < c_1$, or $c_0 < c_1$ and $c_2 < c_3$, or $c_0 < c_1 < c_2$. As L. Hare, who has used the Williams' Latin Squares in OofA experiments, notes (personal communication, August 1, 2016), "I have done some work with order of addition, mostly related to food ingredients. It can make a very big difference for emulsions,

for example. I've used a few full permutation designs, but usually the experimenters have some prior knowledge, especially about what orders will not work." In such cases, we can simply first reduce the number of candidate points to agree with the restrictions, create a new set of PWO frequency tables of the kind shown in Figure 1, and use this to define "orthogonal" properties in searching for an OofA-OA.

For analyses, we suggest either of two approaches, both of which are based on the assumption that interactions among the PWO factors are likely to occur. The first follows that of Hamada and Wu (1992)—use a stepwise approach to examine active main effects, and then repeat this approach but now including two f.i.'s that are associated with the active main effects. The second is to use tree-based regression modeling, in which interactions of a certain type are examined naturally.

8 FUTURE WORK

Proving the converse of our theorem and showing that a D-efficiency of 1 is equivalent to D-optimality may both lead to some insights into the structure of OofA designs. We have not been able to create a closed-form method of constructing any OofA-OA's, but have not ruled out such a possibility. For a design with N runs, can the largest m for which an OofA-OA exists be determined for general N and m, for a given t? A catalog of these designs, including a wide class of component-order-restricted designs and the addition of a wide class of process factors, would be useful, as would be the incorporation of our design-construction methods into software packages that are easily accessible to experimenters. The apparent small number of non-isomorphic designs in some cases and large number in others surprised us. Does a structure exist among these? Can the number of non-isomorphic designs be obtained and cataloged? Graphical summaries of key features of the designs, such as groupings among the orthogonal pairs or triples of the PWO factors, may help experimenters in assigning their components to the component labels $0, \ldots, m-1$. We have relied on the D-criterion because of its efficient implementation, but efficient routines for the χ^2-criterion may produce better near-orthogonal OofA designs and designs with better strength-3 properties.

9 CONCLUSIONS

In this article we have introduced a class of OofA experimental designs, for which designs with good properties may be created in a relatively small numbers of runs. By generalizing the idea of OA's to OofA-OA's, we use a natural set of balance criteria to measure the

quality of these designs. A connection made between D-efficient and OofA-OA designs, along with empirical evidence, allows us to use existing D-optimal algorithms to create OofA-OA designs. We have also found necessary conditions for the number of runs needed to create OofA-OA's of strengths 2 and 3. We have created designs for what we believe will be the most common cases, including 12-run OofA-OA's in 4 and 5 components, 24-run OofA-OA's in 5 and 6 components, and 24-run near-OofA-OA's in 7 components. It is possible to extend some of these designs to include process factors, making these designs even more useful. Our methods can be modified to create designs for the common case in which a subset of the component orderings are restricted *a priori* by the experimenter. We also raise a number of questions for future research.

10 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the careful review of the initial draft by Lynne Hare.

References

[1] Black, B. E., Holaska J. M., Lvesque L., Ossareh-Nazari B., Gwizdek C., Dargemont C., and Paschal B. M. (2001), "NXT1 is Necessary for the Terminal Step of Crm1-mediated Nuclear Export," *Journal of Cell Biology*, 152, 141–55.

[2] Clark, J. B. and Dean, A. M. (2001), "Equivalence of Fractional Factorial Designs," *Statistica Sinica*, 11, 537–547.

[3] Fisher, Ronald A. (1971) [1935 original edition], *The Design of Experiments*, 9th ed., Macmillan.

[4] Hamada, M. and Wu, C. F. J. (1992), "Analysis of Designed Experiments with Complex Aliasing," *Journal of Quality Technology*, 24, 130–127.

[5] Hedayat, A. S., Sloane, N. J. A., Stufken, J. (1999), *Orthogonal Arrays: Theory and Applications*, Springer, New York.

[6] Kim, H. A., Ratner, N., Roberts, T. M., and Stiles, C. D. (2001), "Schwann Cell Proliferative Responses to cAMP and Nf1 Are Mediated by Cyclin D1," *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 21, 1110-1116.

[7] Lekivetz, R., Sitter, R., Bingham, D., Hamada, M. S., Moore, L. M., and Wendelberger, J. R. (2015),"On Algorithms for Obtaining Orthogonal and Near-Orthogonal Arrays for Main-Efects Screening," *Journal of Quality Technology* 1, 2–13.

[8] PerkinElmer, Inc. (2016), *User's Guide To Alpha Assays Protein:Protein Interactions*, available at https://www.perkinelmer.com/PDFs/downloads/GDE_Alphatech.pdf, accessed 2/19/16.

[9] Preuss, M., Weidman, P., and Nielsen, E. (2009), "How We Study Protein Transport," in *Trafficking Inside Cells: Pathways, Mechanisms and Regulation*, Segev, N., ed., Springer-Verlag, New York.

[10] Van Nostrand, R. C. (1995), "Design of Experiments where the Order of Addition is Important," *ASA Proceedings of the Section on Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 155–160. American Statistical Association, Alexandria, Virginia.

[11] Warnes, G. R., Bolker, B., Lumley, T. (2015), "gtools: Various R Programming Tools," R package version 3.5.0, available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gtools

[12] Wheeler, B. (2014), "AlgDesign: Algorithmic Experimental Design," R package version 1.1-7.3, available at https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=AlgDesign.

[13] Williams, E. J. (1949), "Experimental Designs Balanced for the Estimation of Residual Effects of Treatments," *Australian Journal of Scientific Research, Series A, Physical Sciences* 2, 149–168.

[14] Williams, E. J. (1950), "Experimental designs balanced for pairs of residual effects," *Australian Journal of Scientific Research, Series A, Physical Sciences* 3, 351–363.

[15] Wu, C. F. J. (1993), "Construction of Supersaturated Designs Through Partially Aliased Interactions," *Biometrika* 80, 661–669.

[16] Xu, H. (2002), "An Algorithm for Constructing Orthogonal and Nearly-Orthogonal Arrays with Mixed Levels and Small Runs," *Technometrics* 44, 356-368.

[17] Xu, H. (2003), "Minimum Moment Aberration for Nonregular Designs and Supersaturated designs," *Statistica Sinica*, 13, 691–708.

[18] Yamada, S. and Lin, D. K. J. (1999), "Three-Level Supersaturated Designs," *Statistics and Probability Letters* 45, 31-39.